

THE SOUTH BRONX'S ECONOMIC REVIVAL

HON. ROBERT GARCIA

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 16, 1982

● Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, the South Bronx is in the early stages of a dramatic revitalization effort. Decreases in arson and burglary, as well as signs of economic recovery, are driving businesses back into this once highly prosperous region.

In the past 12 months, 134 companies have moved into or expanded in the South Bronx. Electrical demand, commercial phone usage, and business activity are up for the first time in years. Perhaps the most encouraging statistics are those showing that robberies and burglaries, the most common problems for businesses, are down by as much as 36 percent in recent months.

Our reviving community offers numerous attractions for an incoming business. Rents are inexpensive, there is a large supply of trainable labor, and the location provides easy access to Manhattan's profitable market. In addition, a strong transportation network and an innovative Con Edison electricity savings program have served to entice prospective businessmen.

I submit this article, a testimony to the atmosphere of revitalization that has taken hold in the South Bronx, for the benefit of my colleagues:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Sept. 16, 1982]

NEW YORK CITY'S BURNED-OUT SOUTH BRONX STARTS A COMEBACK AS FIRMS SLOWLY RETURN

(By Luis Ubinas)

NEW YORK.—The South Bronx, long a national symbol of ruin and despair, is slowly building itself.

Electrical demand, commercial phone usage and business activity are all up for the first time in years. The New York State Department of Commerce reports that in the past 12 months five businesses have been moving into or expanding in the South Bronx for every three that leave or cut back. Businessmen point to cheap rents, available labor and good location as reasons for moving into the area.

And local businessmen and politicians have begun to tackle what is perhaps the most difficult task, that of improving the area's image.

Many Americans were introduced to the South Bronx in 1977, when President Carter stood before television cameras on Charlotte Street in one of the most devastated sections of New York City. Amid acres of burned-out buildings and rubble-strewn vacant lots, the president promised to redevelop the area.

TEN-YEAR-OLD PROBLEMS

That plan fell through. Working against optimism were problems that had had more than 10 years to take root.

In the mid-1960s, drug use, arson and robbery had begun to drive out the tool makers, metal smelters and textile mills that were the backbone of the South Bronx economy. Old-timers in the area tell of

prominent businessmen being murdered and of business deals ruined when visitors were accosted by derelicts.

Only minutes from midtown Manhattan and some of the world's most expensive real estate, the South Bronx came to be portrayed by the news media as a battlefield where arsonists and thieves were winning the fight against police and nearly half a million residents.

By 1979, when street crime and arson peaked, the area was at rock bottom and the future looked bleak. Donald DiMuro, executive director of the Bronx Chamber of Commerce, says, "We were left with nothing."

SOME COMPANIES MOVE IN

But lately, things have begun to look up. Aircraft Supplies Inc., a manufacturer of airplane parts, has moved from New Jersey into the South Bronx. Arlene Blatt, the company's executive vice president, says, "At first I was a little afraid, but rent of \$2.50 a square foot on a long-term lease was unbeatable." When it reaches full production later this year, the company will employ as many as 450 workers.

Panorama Windows Ltd. also moved in to take advantage of low rents. The company relocated last month from fashionable quarters on Manhattan's East Side to a factory near the Triborough Bridge. The company's president and owner, Peter Folsom says, "The 5,000 square feet of yard space and 5,000 square feet of interior space we were able to buy here didn't exist in Manhattan at any price."

Richard Slavin, of Houllhan-Parnes Realtors, says, "Over the past few months there have been fewer vacancies than there have been in years." Rents now are up to between \$5 and \$7 a square foot, but are still below costs in Manhattan and most nearby suburban locations, according to Realtors.

CHEAP, TRAINABLE LABOR

Some companies find the South Bronx attractive because of what an executive calls "cheap, trainable labor." The Weiblit Electronic Die Corp., a defense contractor, considered leaving the area. But Frederick Neuberger, a company vice president, studied the labor situation elsewhere without finding what the South Bronx offered, a "human reservoir of quality workers willing to start at minimum wage."

Another advantage, businessmen say, is the South Bronx's location. Herbert Klein, a director of mattress distributor Klein Sleep Products Inc., says he has seen other companies "offer everything from the Easter Bunny on down to move from the South Bronx," but he himself would never consider such a move.

TROUBLES STILL EXIST

"Forget the low-cost real estate and good work ethic of the people," Mr. Klein says. "What keeps my company in the South Bronx is being right smack in the middle of 20 million potential customers. I'm 12 minutes from Manhattan."

In the past 12 months, 134 companies have moved into or expanded in the South Bronx, more than the total for the previous 22 months. Yet the picture isn't all rosy. A New York Department of Labor "micro-area study" of the South Bronx puts unemployment at 14.8% as of June. And companies are still moving out. Electrical costs, crime and image problems continue to be major concerns.

Businesses are getting a break on New York City's electricity costs, among the highest in the nation. Consolidated Edison Co., the local utility, has started a program that saves new companies in the South Bronx as much as 25 percent on their bills. In recent months, about 90 businesses a

month have applied to the program, up from 25 in the same period last year.

Leonard Fuchs, an executive vice president with M. Tucker Co., a food-equipment distributor moving to New Jersey, says crime was one reason his company decided to move out. "We were broken into two times in one weekend," he says.

But more police and more precautions, such as alarms and dogs, have driven the crime rate down. Lt. Nicholas DeChiaro of the 40th police precinct in the heart of the South Bronx, says statistics show that robberies and burglaries, the most common problems for businesses, are down by as much as 36 percent in recent months.

PERSISTENT IMAGE PROBLEM

Some workers still find the streets unsafe, however. "Of course coming to work is dangerous," says Robert Cummins, an employee of Guardsman Elevator Co. "Anything can happen," he adds. "You could be mugged, you could be killed, anything."

That sort of attitude goes along with the area's persistent image problem. American Banknote Co., which prints foreign currencies, has split itself up to accommodate the image. "What we've done," says Robert S. Ivie, vice president, "is keep our executive offices in Manhattan and just have the people on the production end" in the South Bronx. After all, he asks, "Would you want to work in a place where you could be robbed, where your car could be stripped?"

Bronx politicians have established forums at local colleges, a complaint hotline at Bronx borough hall and a chamber of commerce committee to help new businesses adjust to the area. Even New York Yankee pitching ace Ron Guidry has been enlisted in the effort to make the South Bronx appeal to companies. Starting this fall, cards in city hotel rooms will inform tourists that they can call a number and hear the Cy Young Award winner describe all the "interesting things to do in the Bronx."

But that venture doesn't stir optimism in everyone. "Not many people are going to be coming up," says Donald DiMuro of the chamber of commerce. "You see," he adds, "it's like the rungs of a ladder—you go down one step at a time and you go up one step at a time. Right now we're just getting off the ground."

TELEPHONES FOR THE HEARING IMPAIRED

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 16, 1982

● Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I was extremely pleased when the House overwhelmingly passed S. 2355, the Telecommunications for the Disabled Act of 1982, on Monday. Upon enactment, this measure will prevent an ill-conceived Federal Communications Commission regulation from taking effect on January 1. This rule would have prevented State regulators from making specialized telephone equipment available to the disabled. This bill will insure that the hearing impaired have access to the telephone system of our Nation.

In our society, the telephone has become more than an integral way of life; it can mean the difference between life and death. This is particu-

TRIBUTE TO ADAM BENJAMIN

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 16, 1982

● Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, the following is the well-deserved tribute paid by the Indiana Legislature to our dearly departed colleague, Adam Benjamin:

INDIANA LEGISLATURE RESOLUTION

A concurrent resolution urging the Congress of the United States to authorize a small boat marina within the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore to be named "The Adam Benjamin, Jr. Memorial Marina."

Whereas Congressman Adam Benjamin, Jr. worked unceasingly for the betterment of Lake County, Indiana, by supporting, during his tenure as United States Congressional Representative for the First Congressional District of the State of Indiana, numerous programs and projects designed to improve the quality of life in his district and county; and

Whereas one of the primary projects developed and nurtured by Congressman Adam Benjamin, Jr. was the expansion and development of the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore; and

Whereas one of the dreams of Congressman Adam Benjamin, Jr. and the constituents he represented was construction of a small boat marina as part of the west unit of the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore; and

Whereas the construction of a small boat marina within the west unit of the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore Park was identified as a first priority development element in the park's general management plan; and

Whereas in 1980 the Congress of the United States reviewed the general management plan and the United States Department of Interior approved the plan; and

Whereas through the continued support and coordination of Congressman Adam Benjamin, Jr., several hundred thousand dollars have been spent by the City of Gary, the Lake County Parks and Recreation Department, and the United States Department of Interior for the planning of such a marina; and

Whereas the people of Indiana believe that Congressman Adam Benjamin, Jr. should be honored and forever remembered for the dedicated service he gave to the citizens of his district, county, and state: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the General Assembly of the State of Indiana (the House of Representatives concurring therein):

Section 1. That we urge the Congress of the United States to authorize the construction of a small boat marina in Lake County, Indiana within the west unit of the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore Park, to be named "The Adam Benjamin, Jr. Memorial Marina".

Section 2. The Secretary of the Senate is directed to transmit a copy of this resolution to the President of the United States the Secretary of the Interior, the leadership of each party of each House of Congress, and each member of the Indiana congressional delegation.

Adopted by voice vote this sixteenth day of November, 1982.●

THE STATEMENT OF PATRICIA BREWER

HON. ANTHONY TOBY MOFFETT

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 16, 1982

● Mr. MOFFETT. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I submitted to the RECORD a statement from a constituent with which I did not agree. Today, I am doing so again. My colleagues may wonder why I am doing this. At a hearing I held on child welfare and the New Federalism in Connecticut, two persons felt that they had not been provided the opportunity to present their views. One gentleman is opposed to abortion; he had his say in the RECORD yesterday. Patricia Brewer, coordinator of the Connecticut Catholic Conference, is in favor of tuition tax credits. Although I do not share her views, I did want to fulfill my promise to her that those views would be presented to this body.

Ms. Brewer's statement follows:

I am Patricia J. Brewer. I am a Doctor of Philosophy with an academic concentration in Anthropology and Folklore. I am a long-time participant in the Connecticut educational scene having taught in Connecticut's nonpublic school system on the elementary, secondary, and collegiate levels. I am presently associated with the Connecticut Catholic Conference.

I speak in favor of that aspect of the New Federalism which would allow parents to retain enough of their own earnings to choose the education they want for their children. Specifically, I speak in favor of the Educational Equity and Opportunity Bill: the tuition tax credit legislation which is set for mark-up this week in the Senate Finance Committee. I am here to ask that you give some fresh and clear thought to the justice of our present system of educational finance and that you cease active opposition and begin active support of legislation that would aid many of your constituents in the performance of the most sacred of their duties: the formation of the minds and hearts of their children.

Parents have the moral responsibility and the constitutionally guaranteed right to educate their children according to their religion-cultural values. Until recently, parents who chose to educate their children in an institution which transmitted Judeo-Christian values had little trouble doing so. They had access to the public, the private, and the parochial schools. All were Judeo-Christian in orientation. Two of them—the public and the parochial were tuition free, the public schools being supported by the state tax dollar, the parochial by both the Church tax and the contributed services of religious teachers.

Not so today. Today, in recognition of our society's religio-cultural pluralism and thanks to several supreme court decisions, the specific teaching of Judeo-Christian values is prohibited in our public schools. Today, in response to the dramatic decline in the contributed services of religious teachers and the inability of the Church tax to sustain the full cost of parochial education, parish schools charge tuition.

Consequently, for most of the poor and the nearly poor and for many of the middle class, there is today no educational choice, there is no educational freedom. Compelled by law and conscience to send their children

to school, and unable to pay the tuition to send them to a nonpublic school, some parents are in a real sense coerced to educate their children in a manner abhorrent to their religio-cultural values. It seems clear that, whatever may have been its justification in the past, our present system of educational finance is neither just nor democratic. Coercion is hardly a principle sacred to democracy.

I am aware that both you, Representative Moffett, and you Representative Kennelly, concerned as you are, and as you should be, with maintaining a quality school system, accessible to all, presently oppose tuition tax/credit legislation. I am aware also of the cliched bugbears which are bandied about by the organized, vested-interest opposition to the legislation. Because I recognize in your prepared statements of rationale for opposition to tuition tax credits these bugbears, I would like to confront some of them with you.

The opposition says: Tuition tax credits would lead to the demise of the public school system. They would serve as an incentive to parents to remove their children from the public school. Only the dregs would be left in the public schools.

I say: Nonsense. Tuition tax credits which fully funded would pay only half of actual tuition cost up to a maximum of \$500. Parents sending their children to public schools presently receive an average benefit of \$3000 per child from their tax dollars.

The opposition says: Tax credits would take badly needed money from the public schools.

I say: Not so. During the first year of its implementation the tax credit would cost the federal government \$100,000,000 in federal revenue loss. In its out-year, when fully funded, the estimated loss would be \$1,500,000,000. That revenue loss, when prorated against the entire federal budget would be miniscule. The loss to the budget could easily be balanced by manufacturing one less Trident Submarine. There is no reason to believe that Congress will appropriate one penny more or less to public education because it has allowed citizens who have chosen nonpublic education to withhold some of their earnings to help finance that choice.

The opposition says: The tuition tax credit would benefit the wealthy and not the poor.

I say: It is the marginally poor who will benefit most from the tax credit. It is to the parent who can scrape up \$200 to pay half his child's tuition—but can't get together the \$400 to pay the full tuition that the tax credit will make the difference between educational freedom and educational coercion.

The \$500 maximum tuition credit will hardly influence the decision of a parent paying \$8500 to send his child to a Cheshire Academy—or a Choate Rosemary.

The opposition says: Tuition tax credits are unconstitutional.

I say: There has never been a Federal Tuition Tax Credit. A decision on the constitutionality of that legislation is yet to be had. Students of the Constitution argue for constitutionality. The Supreme Court will and should make this decision—not the legislators.

Representative Moffett—Representative Kennelly, words, whether full of reason or full of sound and fury signify nothing to the ears of those who will not hear. I hope that my words this morning have been somewhat reasonable. I trust that they have not fallen on deaf ears. It would be a privilege to discuss this matter in detail with either or both of you.●

larly true for the elderly, who may often be homebound alone, and their only access to the outside world is via the telephone. One-third of Americans over 65 have hearing impairments which require the use of a hearing aid. S. 2355 will insure that newly manufactured telephones will be compatible with hearing aids. In addition, this measure encourages phone companies to provide specialized equipment at affordable prices to people with other physical disabilities. The immeasurable benefits which this legislation provides far outweigh the insignificant cost of this measure. ●

THE PEOPLE'S PARADISE

HON. JACK FIELDS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 16, 1982

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, some form of socialism/communism is dominant in many nations and every continent. The idea of socialism is especially attractive to intellectuals who are able to maintain a comfortable distance from actual socialist practices.

Though socialism is a god that fails continuously, and causes more human suffering and tragedy than any idea of practice in history, there are those who stubbornly cling to its high-minded idealism. They religiously close up their eyes to the reality that the socialist promise of instant utopia brings only the tyranny of a real dystopia.

It is for them that the following glimpse of reality is provided.

[From *Chronicles of Culture*, November 1982]

LETTER FROM PARIS: MITTERRAND'S FRANCE (By Thomas Molnar)

Since I have never traveled behind the Iron Curtain, I can only compare Mitterrand's France with socialist Burma, where the Minister-General Ne Win's heavy hand lies even on tourists. France is not yet a Soviet-style state, but a few verbal snapshots can provide a picture of developments in summer 1982, after twelve months of the present regime.

The setting is in a new building, the office of a leftist-Catholic professor-editor. He has just finished writing his third semiclandestine (*samizdat*?) "letter to friends," calling on them to resist the ideologues who are demolishing the country economically and culturally. "In this office," he remarks with a wry smile, "we may still speak openly; as far as I know the walls have no microphones."

At France's border with Switzerland many travelers are stripped and searched in order to stop their fleeing francs from reaching the safe-deposit boxes of Swiss banks. Address books are photocopied by customs officials, later checked for names of friends whose monies you may be helping escape. A matchbox bearing the name of a Zurich bank can make one a suspect. Not only are the smaller fortunes fleeing (the big ones escape more officially as "transfers" or "investments"), but new investments—by Arabs, Japanese, Germans—are not forthcoming. One year's socialist-communist management has sufficed to make France's economic future bleak. I talked with young,

enterprising businessmen, lawyers, scientists, all of whom contemplate emigration and spend their days devising ways and means to do so. Perhaps Mitterrand believed Pol Pot when he claimed that people are expendable and that one million hard communist Cambodians are enough for the country's future. During the summer, 2,000 gendarmes spread through France, checking for conformity to the postfreeze price of butter and eggs. Meanwhile, the minister of justice freed thousands of criminals after abolishing, through parliamentary majority, his predecessor's semitough law on security. Industries—the ones not yet bankrupt—are working halftime, while hopelessly struggling against worker demands encouraged by the government. Unemployment has risen beyond two million, and the number of those out of work continues to rise. Some expect that the communists might wait for more bitterness, then organize the unemployed into "worker militias."

Is "communism" indeed Mitterrand's objective? He is known to be strongly against it. A close friend of his whom I queried said that the first adjective coming to his mind describing Mitterrand is *opportunist*. There may be no contradiction here; the four communists in the cabinet can scarcely do more damage than some of the socialist hierarchs, who are more Marxist than Marx. The whole picture recalls the Allende regime in Chile: fanatic, incompetent socialists trying to prove to their communist colleagues that Muscovite obedience is stifling—whereas socialists bring new techniques and strategies to the pink international. While Mitterrand is increasingly Buddha-like in his inscrutability, his minister of industry and technology, Jean-Pierre Chevènement, a man 20 years younger, emerges as the chief activist and ideologue. Again: is Chevènement a Marxist? The term is irrelevant, since "we are all Marxists now" and Chevènement represents simply a new, perhaps already international, Marxian activist model. Some 12 years ago, it is said, he wavered between leftist Gaullism and socialism; since then, he has fused the two and combined that explosive mixture with the utopian socialism (Engels *ditto*) of the French 1840's—Comte, Proudhon, but particularly Fourier. Chevènement's avowed goal—which he admits only in private—is a monolithic France, frugal and efficient, a model for the Third World. He brings to mind St. Just, the fiery young orator of the Revolution who narrowly missed stepping into Robespierre's shoes. Chevènement, whose ambition is limitless, regards himself as a stricter, less literary Mitterrand—and as a future president.

I love France, so I should not be suspected of deliberately painting a dark picture of the country. Voltaire's observation that "every man has two countries, his own and France" certainly applies to me. Thus I may close one eye when socialist leaders Quilès and Mermaz (the latter the speaker of the National Assembly) threaten the opposition with the line "heads will roll," or when moderate minister of economics Jacques Delors calls the opposition spokesmen "fascist loudmouths." But I am less tolerant with minister of culture Jack Lang, who ordered that on June 21, 22 and 23 (the summer solstice) France be turned over to "music and fun" with the result that screeching noise filled every arrondissement in Paris, and amateurish clowns stopped pedestrians at every corner. This is the socialist notion of "people's culture," while at the same time serious journalists—if they are critical of public policy—are denied newsprint, and television airs pornography and propaganda hour-long analyses of Mitterrand's books. To an unprejudiced eye, the

officialization of fun has saturated France with a mood which is obviously morose. The abuses continue: unannounced strikes block vacationers at airports, company executives are sequestered in their offices, an old chateau is burned down by protesting workers. And the regime that once promised paradise now is already shopworn, fighting ridicule with threats instead of positive measures or competence. Even the small bourgeoisie—the country's backbone ever since the peasantry drastically diminished in numbers—is up in arms. But, unlike the summer of 1789, their anger is turned against the left, supposedly their official representative. From rich man to cafe waiter, they all exclaim: "Monsieur, cela ne va plus du tout, cela ne peut pas continuer!" What do they foresee? It is expected that the March 1983 municipal elections will clearly signify that the nation has had its fill of demagogic promises and catastrophic results. The regime is trying to meet this challenge by redistricting, most notably by fragmenting Paris (which, for a change, is now in an anti-revolutionary mood) into 20 independent—and socialist—fiefdoms. But the mayor of Paris, Jacques Chirac, is head of the opposition and a popular man. He asked the obvious question: why not divide Marseilles, too? The mayor of Marseilles is R. Deferre, minister of interior; the issue was quickly shelved.

Mitterrand came to power largely on the implied promise that his would be a "socialism with a human face," the slogan of the Prague Spring and of the later vogue of Eurocommunism. Those who voted for him in 1981 have had a rude awakening and have yet to digest communist participation in important ministers. My feeling is that if Mitterrand, even now, dismissed the four communist cabinet ministers, popular opinion would turn in his favor. Much of the fled capital might also return. It may be worthwhile, therefore, to speculate on Mitterrand's motives in keeping them on. He obviously regards himself as a leftist de Gaulle, heir to the policy of an alternative to both Moscow and Washington. When he nationalized banks and other enterprises, he reasoned that "in the world of multinationalals the government must watch over the country's sovereignty." Next comes Mitterrand's conviction that France has for too long been a bourgeois country, and must regain a position of leadership among those who look toward a new revolution. This accounts for its aid to and rhetoric about Nicaragua and the like. It should not be forgotten that de Gaulle, too, tried to awaken national consciousness—and a "third option"—from Phnom Penh to Quebec. There is a greater continuity of French policies than meets the eye.

The most frightening aspect of Mitterrand's France is its egalitarian impulse. Igor Shafarevich theorized that socialism is the symptom of a nation's tiredness. I think that is a dangerous half-truth. Egalitarianism is a passion of envy and brutal ambition: in the end, it manipulates and reduces society to a geometrical pattern. A socialist society is not peaceful and passive but restless and combative. Most of the people I talked with in France were either cynical regarding the future ("plus ça change, plus c'est la même chose") or despairing. But there were others, too, new Jacobins with eyes ablaze at the prospects of drastic change. Chevènement is reputed to have suggested that all Frenchmen should think alike on issues of national and global import. His acolytes warn—so far, discreetly—intellectuals and professors that debates "in a critical vein," are not desirable. The consequence is, of course, that students spy on teachers, col-

leagues report colleagues, journalists, researchers and bankers look over their shoulders when talking, writing, deciding.

An often-heard adjective of Mitterrand's regime is "generous": a new and generous policy, a generous interpretation of the law, mistakes made out of generosity. Let us remember that while sending thousands to be "married to the guillotine," Robespierre had his mouth full of *virtue*.

STATE OF OUR NATION

HON. BOB TRAXLER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 16, 1982

● Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Speaker, I want to share with the Members of the Congress an eloquent and articulate capsulization on the state of our Nation. The article which follows is reprinted from the Tuscola County Advertiser, a highly respected weekly newspaper which serves a large rural portion of my district. It was written by Mr. Rudy Petzold, publisher and owner of the newspaper.

Mr. Speaker, I share this article with you because I was highly impressed, as I am sure you will be too, by the commitment and concern evidenced in this writing about the direction which our Nation is taking. This article truly captures a sense of what is going wrong in our country.

It calls for moderation from the White House and a return to the true basic American values such as compassion, realistic economic policies, fairness to the little guy, a lean, strong and credible national defense, protection for our elderly, and hope for all our youth. I could not agree more wholeheartedly.

This article reflects the unwavering commonsense of the American people. I think it merits the recognition of this Congress.

(From the Tuscola County (Mich.) Advertiser)

TRICKLE-UP

(By Rudy Petzold)

Mr. President . . . it's getting awfully tough for us out here to understand what you're trying to do up there.

Your "trickle down" supply side economics is turning into a major waterfall . . . and a lot of the ordinary folks that trusted and believed in you on election day are wondering whether you've lost your handle on things.

These people—and I was one of them—believed that you would bring sense and moderation to government. You talked sensibly. You talked with compassion. And those were the things that I believed necessary to gradually bring America out of the economic mess it has gotten itself into.

But as time goes on, I am having trouble believing you. And I am having great trouble in understanding your approach.

It took us 40 years to get into the mess we're in—we can't get out of it in less than 40 years. Both you and I are going to be dead and buried before the job is completed. This generation and its children simply cannot make up four generation's worth of free-wheeling.

In the last few weeks I've watched the television shows . . . hungry people, people

living in tents, people seeing their little business fold, people suddenly left jobless and without hope. And even that would be bearable if everyone was feeling the bite.

But they aren't. The rich truly are getting richer. The poor are truly getting poorer. And those of us caught in the whipsaw of the middle-class which makes up the country's biggest segment, are feeling themselves sliding and sliding and sliding.

Most of the jobs in America are provided by the middle class that is being destroyed. Most of the taxes that are used to build schools and roads, support churches and charities, build towns and maintain them—come from the middle class that your "trickle down" theory is now destroying.

Instead of building new production facilities and expanding the hard production capabilities of America—the rich are gobbling each other up in endless mergers and takeovers. They sit at their corporate tables playing gargantuan "Monopoly games" and the little people who built their pyramids and palaces matter not one iota. Only the "bottom line" matters to them—to hell with the people that create the bottom line.

You brag about inflation being brought under control. Yes, the inflation in the private sector is slowing—but what about the tax hogs of the government? The property tax on my home went up 30% in one year. The property taxes on my business went up 20% in one year. And these increases are at a time when no one wants to buy them, or could afford to buy them. The tax is even higher when related to the declining value both homes and businesses represent in these times.

This "trickle down" business surely has not trickled down to county, township and school tax collectors who have just blasted us with another horrendous tax increase in dollar terms. And still they do not have enough money.

Your paranoia about national defense is disturbing. The MX and the other toys of destruction that the military keeps on wanting are sucking billions and billions of little people's dollars into the cesspool of military extravagance. We need a defense to save us from defense.

This nation has to be strong—but you've got the wrong idea about what strong means. Strength is not determined by the number of swords, but by the will, who wield them. Your bull-headed refusal to back down on the extravagance of military spending destroys a lot of credibility and it disgusts me.

What will the horrible force of destruction defend—if America itself is gutted by the rich and left in economic disaster by bull-headed refusals to moderate the long-term job of reconstruction and rebuilding of our nation's economic strength.

Our business is having the worst times since the depression. We are flowing in red ink. But at least we can still afford the red ink. My heart goes out to the millions of little people, young people, elderly and hope-shattered people who are seeing what little they have evaporate and who are left with the feeling that this land is now run in the interests of the wealthy who live like fat and uncaring pharaohs off the slaves out in the brick pits.

You want to move the tax cut up from July to January 1983. Do it—but divert the entire tax cut to people who make \$25,000 a year or less and exempt everyone whose income tops that. We don't need any more "trickle down" . . . we need some "trickle up."

Give the benefits, the money, the breaks to the little guys—there are millions of them. They will begin spending the benefits, the breaks and the money because they

have to survive. Giving them to the rich just sends more gold to their vaults and gives them more chips to play with in their games of corporate wheeling-dealing.

Mr. President, we cannot rebuild America in just four years. We desperately need a strong dose of moderation, the kind of moderation that most of us Americans who voted for you thought we would be getting.

WESTERN HEMISPHERE CONFERENCE OF PARLIAMENTARIANS ON POPULATION AND DEVELOPMENT

HON. PAUL N. McCLOSKEY, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 16, 1982

● Mr. McCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, at your direction, the Honorable JOHN E. PORTER, of Illinois, and I attended the recent Western Hemisphere Conference of Parliamentarians on Population and Development in Brasilia, Brazil, from December 2 to 5.

This conference followed a world conference held in Sri Lanka in 1977 and the earlier world conference in Bucharest in 1974. Delegates from 20 Western Hemisphere countries concluded the conference with a unanimous declaration including the following key recommendation calling on parliamentarians of the Western Hemisphere to:

Establish National Committees of Parliamentarians on Population and Development which can:

Increase understanding among parliamentarians of the interrelationship between population and development.

Promote a dialog between parliamentarians and social, economic, and population planners and administrators.

Review, propose, and modify—according to the needs of each country, legislation that relates to population and development.

Insure that all individuals can exercise their basic right to decide freely and responsibly the number and spacing of their children, by providing family planning information and services. Family planning services must be voluntary and be provided in ways that respect human dignity, individual rights, and spiritual values.

Include parliamentarians in official delegations to the United Nations and other conferences, particularly the United Nations Population Conference to be held in Mexico City in 1984.

A copy of the unanimous declaration of the conference is attached:

DECLARATION UNANIMOUSLY ADOPTED BY THE WESTERN HEMISPHERE CONFERENCE OF PARLIAMENTARIANS ON POPULATION AND DEVELOPMENT BRASILIA, DIGEST, DECEMBER 5, 1982

We, the parliamentarians attending the first Conference of the Western Hemisphere Conference of Parliamentarians on Population and Development

Wish to express our sincere gratitude to the government and people of Brazil for